

WALDHOLTZ], for the purpose of calling a privileged rule.

□ 1145

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2002,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 241

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, under this particular resolution, is the legislative branch appropriation affected by this particular rule, or is it exclusively the Transportation branch?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This rule will make in order the Department of Transportation Appropriation conference report.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, since the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] has herself circulated a letter on this gift ban issue, does this resolution and rule permit the offering of gift ban or lobby reform legislation, as the Republican whip notice said we would have an opportunity to consider this morning?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This rule does not relate to that subject.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 241 provides for the consideration of the conference report for H.R. 2002, the fiscal year 1996 transportation appropriations bill. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report. The waiver covers provisions relating to legislation and unauthorized items on a general appropriations bill and, further, protects cer-

tain provisions which exceed the scope of differences between the House and the Senate.

Waivers under the rule are in accordance with previous tradition on appropriations conference reports, and in fact, the rule was reported out of committee on a voice vote with no controversy or opposition.

H.R. 2002 provides critical funding for improving and investing in our Nation's infrastructure and transportation needs. For example, the bill increases funding for the Federal Aviation Administration in order to improve aviation safety. It provides \$1.45 billion for the airport improvement program, which is the same level of spending as last year, and provides \$19.9 billion for total highway program spending.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the bill recognizes the need to restructure and downsize the Federal Government. This bill includes provisions to terminate the Interstate Commerce Commission, reduce transit operating assistance funds, and cut administrative expenses of the Department of Transportation, including a requirement to consolidate the Department's extensive field offices, for a savings of \$25 million.

Mr. Speaker, importantly, this bill also changes how we make our funding decisions in this Congress. This bill totally eliminates funding for highway demonstration projects, which previously were a way to funnel more money to favored lawmakers' districts, and instead uses these funds for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Under this bill, we spend next year virtually all of the highway trust funds collected instead of stockpiling those funds to mask the true size of the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reflects fiscal responsibility, and at the same time provides sufficient funding for our transportation and infrastructure needs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding me the customary one-half hour of debate time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we do not oppose this rule. It is a traditional rule for a conference report on an appropriations bill, waiving all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

However, we would like to point out to the membership our concerns about the legislation that the rule makes in order, which provides appropriations for transportation programs for fiscal 1996.

Our primary concern is that this bill shortchanges, we believe, many valuable services that the American people have come to depend upon for the safe-

ty and reliability of our Nation's transportation systems. For example, the legislation cuts AMTRAK rail passenger service by \$158 million; it cuts the Coast Guard by \$281 million; it cuts the Federal Transit Administration by \$563 million; and it cuts the Federal Aviation Administration by \$178 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that the House Democratic conferees took unanimous exception to one provision in the conference report, amendment number 174, which allows the Federal Aviation Administration Administrator to waive current law pertaining to labor management and employee relations. The reasons for our Members' objections to this particular provision will be one of the issues discussed during the course of debate on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat: we have no objections to this rule, and we urge its passage so that the House can proceed to consideration of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for additional time at this point, and so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I basically take the floor to talk about the FAA, because this is a rule bringing up the transportation appropriations in which the FAA is getting more money.

Let me say that I am here today pleading with the FAA to please, please come clean with the Denver media and the people who live in Denver. Let me tell you why.

Mr. Speaker, many of you know we had a huge snowstorm. We have a brandnew airport. I think people have read a lot about that new airport, and they read a lot of negative things about what happened in the control tower at that airport during the snowstorm. The roof started leaking like mad. They had water coming down over all of the instruments. They were putting plastic over all of the instruments. The problem has been that the FAA will not let even one camera in there to see it.

Yesterday another tile fell on one of the air traffic controllers' heads. Luckily, she was not hurt, but they made her sign all sorts of statements and all sorts of everything else. They have also had to remove two air traffic controllers, take them out of service because apparently the leaks are so bad that there is no place to sit in those positions.

Now, here is the problem: Denver is getting dinged for all of this. Everybody is going to laugh at Denver, laugh at Colorado. Denver did not build that tower. That tower was totally under the control of the Federal Aviation Authority. They oversaw it, and they

built it. They selected a contractor who has had, I guess, some problems in the past with roofs. That has been the rumor; but whatever, they ought to be big enough to come out and talk about the problems.

No one expects a brandnew facility like this to kind of open up and leak like it did when this kind of a storm comes through, then to be in this state of denial where they are denying access so cameras cannot even come in and to refuse to come out and really talk to people about what you are going to do to get this up and going is very troubling.

There were some other problems with the ground radar. I understand, and I was very pleased, that the FAA was out there, they went out, they looked at it, they decertified it, but then they recertified it and turned it back on. Many of the people we have talked to out there have said that they just turned it off, they turned it on, it did not solve the problem. It is not seen in that corner of the airport where it was seen at the time the almost-accident occurred.

So we do not want the FAA trying to paint over that either and put a happy face on it.

Mr. Speaker, the FAA has had a model record in the world for air traffic safety, and I absolutely cannot figure out why we are kind of getting the brushoff and why they are not dealing straight with the Denver media. If they want to keep this reputation, they have to come clean. This is not a fungus. It can thrive in sunshine, but if they do not let it in the sunshine, people will wonder what kind of a fungus the FAA is growing.

The taxpayers and everyone else made a huge investment. This investment was to add to the capacity. This airport would have been totally closed down in this storm had it been the old airport. This is to be an all-weather airport. When you have the air traffic control tower built so poorly that you are going to have water coming in and people are having to read the instruments under plastic because the water might short something out, and now you cannot even have as many people up there and you cannot even let the cameras in to see it because no one wants to admit it happened on their watch. That is why people are cynical about government.

So I plead with the FAA, I plead with them, to go and come clean. Let the media see what happened, tell us how you are going to fix that. Do not put it on my city. They did not do that. You oversaw it. Take the responsibility. Stand up, stand for something, because I think the citizens of Colorado are getting to be a little impatient with all of this, everybody pointing at everyone else and then locking the doors so nobody can really get in and see.

If the contractor made a mistake, go get the contractor. Tell us how you are going to fix it. Make sure that airport does what the taxpayers paid for: Be-

come the best all-weather and the safest all-weather airport in the world.

I am a pilot. I understand how important that is. We were so proud of how it worked on the opening day when we had a terrible, terrible snowstorm and everything went like this. The ceiling did not collapse or leak at that point and the ground radar was working properly, I guess, at that point.

Mr. Speaker, we want it to work. This is like getting a new car and it falls down as you drive it out of the showroom. Get it fixed, FAA, because we are getting impatient.

Mr. BEILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what is happening here this morning is truly amazing. By this rule, we set the order of debate here in this House, and last night we were given an indication of what the order of debate would be, and again, as recently as a few hours ago this morning we were given an indication of what the order of debate would be in the official Republican whip notice. That order was to consider the legislative branch appropriations bill. With that in mind, the Democratic Caucus met this morning and overwhelmingly voted to support the gift ban legislation, the gift ban rule to be more specific, that the Senate has approved on a bipartisan basis 98 to 0.

However, for some reason, bipartisanship in this building stops in the middle of the Capitol rotunda, because instead of dealing with the issue of gifts this morning, we are dealing with another piece of legislation all along. What has happened is, a giant pulled stamp should be put on the legislative appropriations bill. Right after the Democratic Caucus votes for reform, and tries to change business as usual here, deal with this issue of gifts, what happens? The measure is pulled.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that it is appropriate for this body to focus on reforming itself before, not after, it deals with all of these substantive issues. It is particularly ironic, given the fact that the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] has circulated a letter to all of her colleagues in favor of gift ban reform, and yet we have had opportunity after opportunity after opportunity to vote on it, not just to talk about it, not just to issue a press release about it, not just to posture about it, but to vote about it and do something about these gifts, and the Republican majority has continually voted the other way, voted against reform from the first day of this session when a gift ban item came up. Through June, twice, through July, and in October of this year, the last time the legislative branch appropriations were up, the same thing happened, and now today, when we have an opportunity to look in this box and see what gifts people can still be given, the snow is about to fall, I understand, in Colorado, where the gentlewoman from Colorado just spoke.

You need a trip to the ski slopes? It is still permitted. You need a little chateaubriand and Cabernet Sauvignon? It is still permitted. Do you need tickets to the World Series or the Super Bowl? It is still permitted to be a gift to Members of this body. The only thing that is preventing that problem being dealt with here as our colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike have dealt with it in the U.S. Senate, is the obstructionism and the objection of Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership.

Indeed, the first vote that we took on this issue when every single Republican voted against gift reform was on the first day of this session, where people stood at this very spot and said, let us change business as usual, let us clean up the relationship between legislators and lobbyists, and the response of Speaker GINGRICH to that initiative was that "it was an astonishingly narrow and self-destructive act."

□ 1200

What a comment by those who claim to be revolutionaries, who say they really want to change the way business operates in this House. It is time to address the issue of gifts, and no amount of press releases and no amount of speeches can make up for the continual delay. At every opportunity immediately after action is called for and a united Democratic Caucus gets behind this issue, the Members of the Republican Party jerk it from the agenda.

The American people are not going to stand for continual delay, for continued obstructionism, for continued objection to really changing the way this business of the Congress operates. They want an open House. They want the kind of revolution they were promised but have not gotten from our Republican colleagues.

This is a bill about transportation. It deals with railroads. It deals with highways. It deals with airplanes. Whether you fly, you ride the rails, or you take a trip somewhere, this can still occur today under the rules that do not apply in this House.

Last year the Democratic Congress, before I ever got here, passed a rule to deal with that, passed it twice, and it was killed by Republicans in the Senate.

This year we have asked for action on it again. All we get is it pulled from the agenda so that the legitimate desires of the American people to deal with the issue of real reform in this body, changing business as usual, have been thwarted. If the American people make their voice known that they want real change, not just phony change, we are going to get that change.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am glad to have an opportunity to talk about what is really happening on gift ban legislation in this Congress. I am very encouraged, Mr. Speaker, that

we are going to have an opportunity to give this issue the full hearing and vote on the floor that it deserves.

The gentleman who just spoke objected to the fact that one item was pulled from the legislative agenda today. However, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to note that last night pursuant to a request from the minority there was a unanimous-consent agreement entered into to add 3 hours of general debate on the budget reconciliation package. The minority asked for that time; the majority decided to accede to their request, a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into.

As a result, another item was pulled from the schedule to allow that 3 hours of debate to be added to our agenda for today.

But in particular, Mr. Speaker, on the gift ban legislation, last week those of us who have been working on this legislation from the beginning of this Congress received a commitment from our leadership, from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, that by the end of this week he would make an announcement as to when we would take up the gift ban legislation. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that yesterday, Mr. ARMEY, in a discussion personally with me, reaffirmed his commitment that by the end of Friday of this week, he will make an announcement as to when we will take up a vote on the gift ban legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we allow this legislation to go through the hearing process before this measure comes to the floor for a vote. I am not so vain, Mr. Speaker, as to believe that the bill is perfect in the way that I introduced it, because the gentleman said that I have circulated a letter on gift ban. I have done more than that, Mr. Speaker. I am the sponsor of the gift ban legislation that I hope will come, that I believe will be the vehicle that we will discuss when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, makes his announcement.

But I am not so vain, Mr. Speaker, as to believe that that bill cannot be improved through the hearing process. It has not gone through the hearing process yet. That will be a part of the announcement that will come later this week.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minority party this morning voted in conference to support the gift ban bill. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have had some difficulty in getting some cosponsors from the other side of the aisle. The gentleman from California, Mr. BEILENSEN, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, was one of the very first to join me in sponsoring that gift ban legislation. I appreciate that.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we welcome their support and invite them, including the gentleman who previously spoke, who is not yet a

cosponsor of that legislation, to join us in cosponsoring that legislation, so that, when we move it to the floor, we can have true bipartisan support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be sure that I am clear about what the gentlewoman has said. As I understand, her position is we do not take up gift ban this morning because we will have an announcement of a time at some future time, sometime this year, next year, when the majority leader will tell us that we can take up gift ban.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are not taking up gift ban this morning because it is not germane to the Transportation appropriations bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, and with reference to the scheduling, she is not suggesting, I am sure she was here when I queried the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], about this at the conclusion of business last night. She is not suggesting that the additional 3 hours of debate which was scheduled for tonight until the legislative branch appropriations was pulled, that that has anything to do with this gift ban, is she?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I was not here when the gentleman discussed this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] last night. But I do know that the majority leader felt that it was important to allow the 3 hours of general debate that colleagues on his side of the aisle requested. And so this measure was pulled in an attempt to provide the gentleman with the time that his side has requested.

Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we move on. This is not germane to the discussion of the rule that we are discussing.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just was wanting to make clear, the gentlewoman said that there is going to be hearings on the gift ban legislation before it comes to the floor.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the majority leader will be announcing by the end of the this week, as he announced last week, a time at which we will take up gift ban legislation. As the sponsor of the measure, it certainly is my intent and I have expressed that to my leadership and believe that they will follow through with that to provide for a hearing to see if this is a measure that cannot be improved in some way.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, one of the concerns I have had, and I just am sharing this for information, is that once we introduce and pass a bill here that is different from

the one adopted in the Senate, it never becomes law.

We have seen that one of the reasons we have never gotten this passed is this body has passed it before, and it goes to the other body, and it dies, or they pass a different one or they never get together.

What I was hoping is that we could accept what the other body has done and then start with that as a new higher level of morality on this issue to then begin a new, a higher debate. Otherwise, I fear, if we go to hearings, I mean we did not even have hearings on Medicare or Medicaid.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to report to the gentlewoman that whatever we do this gift ban does not need to go back to the Senate because the gift ban is a rule of the House and will not need to be acted on by the other body. So we have complete latitude within the House to do what we feel is appropriate without having to consult with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again, as my good friend from Utah has, remind our colleagues that we are debating the rule on the transportation appropriations legislation. I think that that is something that we should recognize.

I was just a few minutes ago walking out in the Speaker's hallway and was headed back up to the Committee on Rules where we are at this point considering the rule for the reconciliation bill which will begin, as was said earlier, debate this evening and go through tomorrow.

I heard the statement of my very good friend from Texas somehow implying, or I inferred from this, that we had not proceeded with the kinds of reforms that he believed were necessary. I have got to say that, having authored the opening day reforms, having worked with, and I see my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], during 1993 on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that was established. And he worked on the issue of congressional reform before; we spent hours and hours and hours.

We had 37 hearings in 1993; 243 witnesses came before us in 1993. The former majority leadership, as everyone knows, did absolutely nothing with the report that came forward. It was not until we won this new majority, and frankly many Democrats on a regular basis remind me of this, it was not until we won the new majority that we were able to implement the greatest reforms that this institution has seen in a half century.

We all know what those reforms have been. They have been for the most part received extraordinarily well: changing the committee structure, eliminating

proxy voting, insisting on congressional compliance with laws imposed on other Americans.

To claim that nothing has been done in the area of reform, as many have, unfortunately, is absolutely preposterous.

My friend from Utah is the sponsor, as she has just said, of legislation dealing with the gift ban issue. As we look at overhauling the entire makeup of the Federal Government, this clearly is a priority and something that we are going to be considering. But I believe that it is crazy to in any way imply that this historic 104th Congress has not brought about major reforms. I hope very much that the American people and our colleagues will recognize that.

With that, I urge strong support of this rule that is being carried by my friend.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague from California, while he may have made some changes that Democrats recommended in the last Congress, when it came to separating the lobby and the legislators, he has done absolutely nothing. The only lobby this group cares about are the Girl Scouts and Catholic charities. They are all worked up about them lobbying. But when it comes to polluters, when it comes to loophole lawyers, they have done nothing but to fill this box to overflowing with gifts for Members of this House.

The comments of the gentlewoman from Utah are absolutely amazing. I stood on this floor last night and asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] myself about the schedule for today. There was no suggestion that there would not be time today to take up the issue of gifts. Quite the contrary, he indicated we would be debating on into the evening with reference to this issue.

The suggestion that we need to have a hearing is an unusual one because the lobby reform bill, if the gentlewoman will go up to the Speaker's dais, she will find it sitting there. It has been sitting there since it passed the Senate, not even a referral from the Speaker of the lobby reform bill.

With reference to the gift ban itself, it is true that there was a secret closed-door meeting in front of the Ethics Committee concerning the possibility of a gift ban. They have had weeks and months to act on it, just as this body has had an opportunity to act. The suggestion that we ought to delay again today in order to wait not for action but for another promise from the majority leader that maybe some day, some year, some week, some month we will get around to doing something about this problem of gifts and lobby reform is the only thing crazy that I have heard, with all due respect to the gentleman from California who used that phrase.

I suggest that, when the House has had an opportunity to vote on this measure and has been continually thwarted, it is time to give us an opportunity to take up the issue again today. There is no reason, this body will finish its business by mid-afternoon under this new schedule. There is absolutely no way that this Congress cannot reform itself today, if we were permitted to do so.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply remind the body that we are trying to move forward on a rule for the transportation appropriations budget. I think it is important that we move forward so that we can reach the other items on our agenda today, not only this bill. We have important discussions to enter into regarding the budget reconciliation bill, which is probably the most important bill that this Congress will take up this year.

So I would simply say to my colleague that I do not think it is asking too much of our majority leader to be able to wait until Friday of this week to make an announcement as to when we will take up the gift ban measure and discuss other congressional reform measures beyond that which we have discussed here today so that we have an opportunity to finish the budget reconciliation bill, which we must move forward on today and tomorrow. Then the very next day we can expect an announcement as to when we are going to move this important gift ban legislation and other congressional reforms forward.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who feel so strongly about this issue to join me in sponsoring this legislation, as some of them have not yet done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Utah that we appreciate her patience. If she will give us about 5 minutes more, we will be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow up on some of the comments that were made by my colleague from Texas because I think he has made some important points.

I have been involved, as the gentlewoman from Utah knows, in the bipartisan effort to reform this institution. I do so because I fervently believe that institutional reform is not a Democratic issue. It should not be a Democratic issue. It should not be a Republican issue. It should be an issue that brings the parties together because it is an issue that strikes at the integrity of this institution.

I have to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that I have been frustrated over the

last 8 or 9 months because it reminds me about Lucy holding that football for Charlie Brown. Each time we get close to being able to debate these issues and bring them to the floor, the football is taken away. Another reason is given to us as to why we cannot debate gift reform and lobbying reform. I think it is important that we keep those two issues together.

□ 1215

I certainly will be encouraged if we do have a date certain for gift ban reform to be brought to this floor. I think it is important that we do so, but we cannot forget that equally important issue of lobbying reform. I find it somewhat perplexing and ironic that now the leadership wants to divide these two issues, bring the gift ban reform to the floor, but not bring the lobbying reform to the floor. Now why is this? Why do we not want to move them together? Both bills or both measures have gone through the Senate. They are both in excellent shape. We should have the opportunity to debate these and move them forward.

I think that this legislative appropriations vehicle is a very good vehicle, and for my friends on the other side of the aisle who have not been through this exercise before, I can assure them that there are people, mostly people who have been around here many, many years longer than we have, who want to love these issues to death. That is what they want to do, they want to love these issues to death. They do not want these issues brought to the floor, and they are going to find as many ways as they can to kill it.

That reminds me a little bit of the Paul Simon song "Fifty Ways To Leave Your Lover." They are going to find 50 ways to make sure these measures do not go into effect to affect this institution.

So, I think the people truly interested in reforming this institution, I think there are people on both sides, have to step up and say, "Enough is enough is enough. It is time that the gift ban legislation comes to the floor, and it is definitely time that the lobbying legislation comes to the floor as well."

It is unfortunate that the legislative appropriations bill was pulled. I am hopeful, perhaps naively so, but I am hopeful that we will have enough push from people from both sides of the aisle that, when these measures come up again in the next day or two, that the leadership will finally acknowledge the reality that there is support from a majority of people in this institution to vote on it, and I truly hope that we do get a chance to vote on it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is the gentleman aware that Speaker GINGRICH has kept since July 26 the lobby reform bill that

the gentlewoman wants an announcement for us to wait on? It has been sitting there since July 26 and has not even been referred to a committee for any hearing or any appropriate action.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I was not aware of that until yesterday, and again I think it is something that should move forward.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding this time to me. I just wanted to clarify a point.

I came over to the floor hearing a rather lively, but nongermane, discussion about a gift ban in the context of the, as I understand it, transportation appropriations conference report, and I want to clarify a point that the gentlewoman made earlier. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is one of the more eloquent and dynamic speakers in the House, is thundering along with righteous indignation about the fact that the House has not taken up a gift-ban related legislation to date. She made the point that she is the primary sponsor and author of a gift ban for House Members, and I want to clarify again that the gentleman from Texas is not a cosponsor of the gentlewoman's legislation.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. RIGGS. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the gentlewoman to clarify that point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. That is correct.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman is aware that I was the third person in this House to call for a discharge petition on the gift ban last spring, long before the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] bothered to even initiate any action, but if it is such a good idea, why do we not pass her bill today?

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman, if he feels that strongly, to the point where he has signed a discharge petition, why he is unwilling or unable to cosponsor the gentlewoman's bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. I am not only willing to cosponsor it, I am willing to vote for it today, and that is what I am asking for, a vote on her particular proposal, but what she wants is to delay it—

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, then the gentleman would have no objection then if we were to prepare a form now and add his name as a cosponsor of the gentlewoman's bill. We will just drop it right down here at the slot where it is appropriate to add cosponsors of congressional legislation at any time. If the gentleman would like to write that out, I would be happy to drop it in the slot.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would ask unanimous consent to do it and further ask

unanimous consent to take it up and consider it at this time so we can go on and vote it out of here right now if it is such a great idea.

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, unanimous consent is certainly not necessary for the gentleman to become a cosponsor. All that is necessary for the gentleman to become a cosponsor is for him to simply write something out to that effect, and I would be happy to provide it in the slot down there—

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add my name as a cosponsor to the legislation of the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). In the opinion of the Chair the chief sponsor of the bill is responsible for that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe unanimous consent is not necessary. We welcome the gentleman in support of our legislation.

Mr. DOGGETT. She could do it right now by unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is only the responsibility of the chief sponsor to add names.

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF LOBBY REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. DOGGETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider that bill at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already denied that recognition earlier.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the reason that we are forced to discuss this matter on a nongermane bill is because we are not allowed to discuss this matter when it is germane. The Republicans, I believe three or four times now, have opened up the rules of this House to make minor changes to the rules and the runnings of this House, and yet they have refused even at that time to take up the gift ban. All that is necessary for the gift ban in this House is for the Speaker just to say "no" to the lobbyists and just to say "yes" to letting the bill come up. It affects only the rules of the House, as the gentlewoman has pointed out, and it can be done in a matter of moments, and we can be done with it, and we can then go to the public and show them what we have severed, that relationship with lobbyists and with others who seek on a daily basis to shower the Members of this House with gifts hoping to seek an audience, time, effort, or whatever on behalf of their interests. Many of us have done this in our own offices, but it ought to be the policy of this House, and what is standing in the way is the Speaker and the majority leader who want to keep telling us about the procedure that they want to consider as opposed to the changes in the laws, and therefore, we have to raise this issue on the legislative ap-

propriations bill, or now in the transportation bill, because we cannot get an audience, and we cannot get a hearing, and when we raise it where it might be vulnerable, we see the bill is taken from the schedule because there may be a vote in support of this position, and now we see that when it looks like gift ban is coming to a head, they want to sever it from the lobbying bill. The lobbying bill has been sitting at the desk. We know that another bill can be sent, it can be sent to conference, and our colleagues can finesse this, and the public will never get lobbying reform that they are clamoring for and that they are demanding from this institution.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot go through a legislative dance. Our leadership went through this legislative dance 2 years ago, and we ended up with no results. Our colleagues can go this legislative dance again, and those of us who are interested in lobby reform, gift reform, and election law reform, and even campaign finance reform, we can sit here and watch the dance, and nothing will happen, and the public will be deprived. We are entitled, as Members of this House, to better than that, and the public is entitled to better than that. What they are entitled to is the consideration of this legislation.

I appreciate proxy reform, but it does no good if we do not allow proxy voting and the members who are sitting in the committee are there burping from the dinners that they have had with lobbyists and others as they vote on legislation that is before the committee. It is more important that we take care of the severing of those relationships, that we reform the lobbying practices around here and we get on with campaign finance reform. That is what we ought to do, that is what the public wants us to do, that is what they thought our colleagues were going to do when they voted for them in the last election, but that is not what has happened, and it has not happened because Speaker GINGRICH, majority leader ARMEY, they continue to thwart the path of this legislation and consideration of it to the floor of the House.

We ought to be able to deal with that and deal with it now, and the continued delay, when we have the rules up, it is not the right time; when we have the bill up, it is not the right time; when we have the conference report up, it is not the right time, it is not germane. That is the dance of legislation that has kept us away from these kinds of reforms for the last 20 years.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that the last 20 years have been controlled by the gentleman's party. In the first 8 months we have accomplished extraordinary change in this Congress. We are going to enact a bill this week that will balance the budget over the next 7 years, and then the very next day our majority leader is going to announce when we will take up this legislation.

I think we are making progress, Mr. Speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], our colleague.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding this time to me.

This has been such a fascinating discussion, and, as my colleagues know, it would be laughable if some of these people on the other side actually were not taking it seriously.

I mean here is a party that literally controlled the House for 40 years and never did any of these things, and now they are all upset because they have to wait a day or two. I mean it is a joke. These folks, as my colleagues know, for years made certain that none of this kind of thing ever got to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, there has been more reform in the first 9 months of this Congress than we saw in the entire 20 years that I have served here, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] who just spoke, he was here before I got here.

So the fact is that we are seeing a number of reforms, and they are just not coming as fast as some of the other people on the other side would like them to come because they are now in a position, not having much to do, they do not have much in the way of policy that they are pursuing, they are losing issue after issue, and so they have now decided that everything they thought was wrong during the 40 years that was their control, they now try to bring over and put on the heads of the people who now control the body.

I mean this is a joke, my colleagues, and I mean it is even kind of a crummy joke.

Now let us get to the real issue of why they want to bring the legislative appropriations bill out here and debate it. The fact is what they are really against is the fact that the legislative appropriations bill actually cuts spending for the Congress. It is a real reform. We actually for the first time are reversing the trend of ever-increasing congressional budget and are actually reducing the amount of money that comes to the Congress. And guess what? When that went down to the President, the President vetoed that bill.

Now here was a bill that cuts the amount of money going to the Congress substantially, and the President vetoed the bill. Now we have got folks defending the President's position. They want to have some reason to vote against this bill that cuts the Congress, and so the fact is what we are really hearing is from people who do not want to cut legislative spending. For 40 years they had that spending climbing. They had staffs around here that burst the seams of the place. We had office buildings full of staff.

Mr. Speaker, we are now trying to cut the budget, and we are going to actually try and sell off an office building, and guess what? The folks who put

all of that in place want to continue the spending, and so they are looking for every excuse possible to try to stop the legislative appropriations bill from being successfully completed.

So now they have latched on to lobbying reform, or gift ban reform, or whatever it is they can come up with. They come to the floor with packages wrapped like Christmas presents and so on, every gimmick in the world. I am surprised they do not go out on the lawn and hold a hearing in the rain again on the issue because every possible gimmick they come up with to try to explain why they want the status quo, but in reality the reality of what is happening here on the floor today is we have got a bunch of people who do not want to cut congressional spending, they do not want the reforms, they do not want the congressional spending cut, and they will use every excuse.

Now I realize that I am engaging in a nongermane debate here as well, and the only reason why I did it is because the other side has decided they are going to have nongermane debate on the floor, which does raise an interesting question. They claim that what they want to do is something about lobbies and gifts. What makes us think that they will obey the rules that we set up under those provisions any more than they obey the rules of the House by coming out here and having these nongermane discussions? The fact is that they are subject to a point of order, that what they have been discussing is totally beyond the rules of the House, it ought not be discussed out here today, and they are discussing having more rules that they say that they will obey those when they cannot obey even the simplest ones on the House floor.

□ 1230

Interesting subject matter, but it is a joke.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman agree that House rules were broken blatantly in conjunction with both the House Bank and Post Office scandals, and that that was during, of course, the Democratic Party's control of the House of Representatives?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, yes, and they did everything possible to try to prevent us from bringing those matters to the House floor. They did everything they could to try to stop us from looking at that.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman agree that the ongoing audit by one of the big six accounting firms of congressional finances, of the House of Representatives' books, has indicated many prima facie violations of House rules, and that that audit is an audit of the administration of the House of Representatives by the Democratic Party?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the fact is that what it at least has indicated is that the books they kept were a mess and no responsible auditing firm could even tell us what really went on, because the books are almost undecipherable. They were an absolute scandal in the way they kept the finances of the House, and yes, it does appear that some people took advantage of that scandalous kind of bookkeeping.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to get into this. I came over here to talk about the Transportation appropriation bill. However, since I do have some considerable experience with the history of reform in this place, I think I would like to put in some perspective what I have heard here on this issue.

I was appointed by the Speaker in 1975 to chair the House Commission on Administrative Review, which was supposed to do a top-to-bottom reform of the House administrative structures, write a new code of ethics, and produce new rules on outside income. That was probably the most bloody and brutal experience I have ever had in this place. It cost me a lot of friends, because we did some very tough things that a lot of people did not like.

I can recall at the time when John Rhodes, who was then the Republican minority leader, appointed his members of my commission. He had the courtesy to come to me and say "DAVE, this is going to be a tough job for you. Understand, I am appointing Bill Frenzel as the ranking Republican," but he said "Just because you get his vote on these issues does not mean you will get any other Republican vote, because frankly, the political pressures in this place are going to take over, and whatever you are going to pass, you are going to have to pass on your own side of the aisle." That is very much what happened. We brought the administrative reforms to the floor of the House, reforms which, among other things, would have created the first professional administrator in the House. I am convinced we would never have had the banking problem or any of the other problems if we had had a professional administrator at that time.

However, when the votes came, we were clobbered. We had significant defections on my side of the aisle, we had a majority voting for it, a big majority, but we had some losses on my side of the aisle, and we got not a single Republican vote to take up those reforms that we had worked so hard on. Through the years, some of them were later adopted, but they were adopted on a piecemeal basis because we had not been able to get them all done on that day. And in fact a few of them were actually put into the rules of the House this year by the new majority

party. I congratulate them for doing that. It is about 20 years late that they came to that position, but better late than never. I will take help on those issues anywhere I can get it.

However, I simply want to take this time to point out that we will probably hear, just as we did a long time ago on those reforms, we are going to hear a lot of hypocrisy, because there are going to be people who say that they really do want reform on gift ban and on lobby reform, but they are going to find every way procedurally to drag their feet, hoping in the end we never finish the job. That, frankly, is at least partially what I think is going on right now.

I just want to warn Members, Mr. Speaker, that when we were involved in this fight over outside income, for instance, we were importuned by a lot of Members not to proceed because it would be unfair to the Members. And when we tried to put limits on outside income, for instance, I remember one Member of the House coming to me and saying "DAVE, you don't understand. It isn't that my law practice takes anything away from my time. It is just that as I rise in seniority, the lobbies toss more business our way and I get a piece of the action." I said, "Yes, I understand that is the deal. That is why we are trying to change it." And he understood, all of a sudden, that this was not a typographical error that we had in our bill, we were really trying to get something done with some teeth.

I would simply say that there is, in my view, nothing more important that this institution can do to restore public confidence in it than to immediately deal with the issue of lobby reform and gift ban. I have had it up to here with having to see television stories about how Members will go off on these phony seminars, that are really golfing vacations disguised as seminars, run by some interest group that lobbies this place. That should not happen. That should not be allowed. That should be outlawed today, not a week from now, not a month from now, but today.

We tried to do that last year. We passed it in this House. It was bottled up in the other body by the majority leader, and I would say the record on that is clear. I fully agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] when they say that this matter ought to be disposed of now and immediately.

I have been involved in these reform efforts for some 20 years. I know foot dragging when I see it, and I have seen an awful lot of it the last 3 months. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is right on when he describes where that foot dragging is coming from and why it has to change.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in ending, I would say we are on the Transportation bill, and we have no objections to the rule. I do want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his helpful and I think useful review efforts to pass some reforms in this place, and salute him for his efforts. Nobody has been more deeply involved in trying to get the right kinds of things done around here than the gentleman from Wisconsin. I also would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] this year for her efforts, to wish her well, and to express the hope that in fact we will be able to vote soon on this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts the gentleman from Wisconsin has made on congressional reform in the past. I appreciate the efforts this Congress has made in the last 10 months.

Real progress was made in this new majority, Mr. Speaker. We have already limited the terms of committee chairmen, we have banned proxy voting, so Members of Congress need to attend their committee hearings, rather than simply allow someone else to exercise their authority for them. We cut committee staffs by one-third.

We have had a house audit that has resulted, unfortunately, in the prior books of this House receiving the lowest rating possible from the accounting firm hired to perform that audit. We have changed the committee structure, and we intend to do more change of that committee structure in the future. And, for the first time, we passed the Shays Act, which will apply all of the laws regarding employment to Congress, so Congress will live by the same laws that we impose on everyone else throughout the country.

These are real reforms, Mr. Speaker, that were enacted by this Congress, and I would suggest that those who believe in reform and want to see reform continue to pay attention to what is going to happen by the end of this week as we announce a schedule for moving forward on additional reforms that were not sufficiently supported in the past, but I believe will be passed by this Congress. I welcome and am encouraged by the attention and the interest from the other side of the aisle to join with those of us who have been working on this issue to get these reforms passed in this Congress.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would simply remind my colleagues that we are voting on the Transportation appropriations bill, that this is an important bill that has received support from both sides of the aisle. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill so we can move forward in making some substantial investment in transportation infrastructure in our country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 241, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 20, 1995, on page H10488.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to the bill, H.R. 2002, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we present to the House the conference report to accompany H.R. 2002, the Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

As Members know, the start of the fiscal year began 3 weeks ago, and the time to conclude the remaining appropriation bills wanes with each passing day. The Department of Transportation, like 11 other Government departments, is operating under the strict terms of the continuing resolution. This conference report will provide funding to further the important operation of transportation programs, including air traffic control, Coast Guard operations, and other critical transportation safety programs outside the continuing resolution.

The Transportation bill always requires a delicate balancing act, and this year proved to be no different. The conferees have had to deal with competing demands for very limited funds. The conference agreement represents the very best effort of the conference committee to achieve a balanced and fair bill, and may I say to colleagues on both sides, a bipartisan bill. This bill has been totally and completely bipartisan. We did not make any decisions in the bill based on partisanship, and we hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that we

can continue that for many years to come.

The conference report before the House today totals \$12.5 billion in discretionary budget authority, and \$11.4 billion in new outlays. The conference report is below the subcommittee's allocation for discretionary budget authority, and just at its allocation for outlays. The total budgetary resources provided, including new budget authority, limitation on obligations, and exempt obligations, is \$13.1 billion in budget authority, and \$37.3 billion in outlays.

The agreement represents an increase of \$1.5 billion in budget authority over last year. However, this figure is a bit misleading. If the totals are adjusted to exclude a rescission of \$2.6 billion in contract authority that does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, but was enacted by Congress this year, the conference report actually reduces spending by \$1.1 billion below comparable fiscal year 1995 levels.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to some of the specific provisions of the conference report. First, the conference agreement drops the Senate provision which designates the National Highway System. I have been assured by the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that the conferees are making progress on that piece of legislation, and that States will soon be in receipt of some \$5.4 billion in highway apportionments that are being held pending the enactment of the NHS. It is imperative that the NHS be designated very soon, as the withholding of \$5.4 billion in NHS and interstate maintenance funds threatens hundreds of thousands of construction jobs and the Nation's infrastructure.

After the worst year in aviation safety in decades, the conference agreement provides \$4.7 billion for the operation of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Nation's air traffic control facilities, \$110 million over last year's and slightly above the administration's request; let me say it again, above the administration's request.

□ 1245

In addition, \$1.9 billion is provided for FAA facilities and equipment.

The conference agreement includes \$159.6 million above the President's request for equipment to enhance safety and capacity of the aviation system, restoring funds to the FAA for safety equipment, such as airport surface detection systems, wind shear detection systems, improved weather detection and forecasting systems, and replacement for computers at Aurora, IL, and our other centers.

In addition, the conference agreement also provides procurement and personnel reform for the FAA. These reforms would permit the FAA to operate much more efficiently and are fully supported by and included, in part, and at the request of the administration.

Despite suggestions made, and I was somewhat disappointed to see this, by the National Air Traffic Controllers Union, the conference agreement does not force the disestablishment of any existing management labor agreement or lead to the dissolution of any union currently representing the FAA employees.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear about this and quote from the statement of managers, and I quote: "The conferees do not intend that the personnel management reforms in this bill force the disestablishment of any existing management-labor agreement, or lead to the dissolution of any union currently representing FAA employees."

It is interesting that when the air traffic controllers came by to see us, they raised the issue of the 5 percent pay differential. The House went with the 5 percent pay differential, because we think it is important to support the air traffic controllers. The Senate did not. Yet now we hear not that the air traffic controllers union is grateful that this was done and they appreciate what the committee did. They now come in with something that they never raised with us during a meeting on the day of the conference when they spoke to us; they never even raised the issue. They never even raised the issue.

These provisions, Mr. Speaker, would not become effective until April 1, 1996, allowing for sufficient and adequate review by the appropriate authorizing committee. In the wake of the worst year in aviation safety and with equipment failing on a nearly daily basis, as we heard from the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] when she talked about the Denver Airport situation, FAA personnel procurement reforms are necessary. In fact, people would come and say we need to do something. If you just exempt the FAA from procurement and personnel regulations, we can do some of these things, and safety is so important. So we did this in order to bring about these safety changes, and we did it, I might say in fairness to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], in a bipartisan way.

So I think when you come to the FAA, it is safety, safety, safety.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement, as I said, restores the reduction of \$45 million for the 5 percent paid bonus for air traffic controllers. However, in order to accommodate the \$88.6 million estimated for this program, the conferees were required to hold funding for the airport improvement program to the fiscal year 1995 level of \$1.45 billion. The conference report drops controversial language relating to workers' compensation. The conference report also provides new budget authority and obligation limitations for the Federal Highway Administration totaling almost \$20 billion.

The bill includes \$17.550 billion for the primary Federal-aid highway program, and an additional \$2.3 billion for highway programs exempt from the

limitation. In total, highway spending will increase nearly half a billion dollars over comparable fiscal year 1995 levels, to a level that is only half a billion below the fully authorized level of \$20.4 billion.

The conference report includes no special highway demonstration projects, returning some \$350 million appropriated last year in Federal highway aid to the States. Doing so provides greater equity among the States and allows State Governors and departments of transportation to determine the appropriate expenditure of limited Federal highway assistance. Federal highway demonstration projects have gone the way of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone agrees that this is the right thing to do. Every member in the House and in the Senate will now be treated fairly. It will not matter that you happen to be particularly powerful or famous or on a particular committee or having voted a certain way or having come from a certain region or having known somebody. Everybody now will be treated fairly, and I think that is something on which both the Republican party and the Democratic party can agree.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement provides \$2.053 billion for transit formula grants, the midpoint between the House and Senate proposed levels. Within this amount, \$400 million is available for operating assistance, a reduction of \$310 million from last year's level, and \$100 million below the level requested by the President.

Recognizing the limited ability of smaller and more rural transit providers to respond to reductions in Federal subsidies, the conference agreement provides that operating assistance to urbanized areas under 200,000 not be cut more than 25 percent from last year's level.

A total of \$3.375 billion is provided for the Coast Guard. These funds are supplemented by an additional \$300 million to be transferred to the Coast Guard from the Department of Defense, and I appreciate the DOD appropriations subcommittee doing that, because we would have been very hard pressed had we not had the good cooperation of Chairman YOUNG and also Senator STEVENS on the Senate side. In total, funds for the Coast Guard rise \$108 million over fiscal year 1995 levels.

Program increases, however, came at the expense of other programs, like Amtrak. Federal subsidies for Amtrak are curtailed by 20 percent, falling from \$793 million in fiscal year 1995 to \$635 million in fiscal year 1996. Other program reductions include: essential air service, down \$10.8 million; the northeast corridor improvement program, down \$85 million; transit operating assistance, down \$310 million; transit research and development, down \$6.8 million; pipeline activities, down \$6 million.

In total, the conference report kills 20 programs, including local rail

freight assistance, the interstate transfer grants for transit, the right-of-way revolving fund, numerous Coast Guard and FAA activities, and supportive service of the Federal Highway Administration.

Consistent with the will of Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission is eliminated in fiscal year 1996 and is funded at \$13.8 million only for the first quarter of the fiscal year. An additional \$8.4 million is provided for the successor to the ICC and once enacted into law by an authorization Administrative activities of the Department are also trimmed, including awards and bonuses, an 8 staff in the office of the Secretary and 10 political appointees department-wide. The Department is required to consolidate or colocate its extensive field offices saving \$25 million in this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement prohibits training that is offensive to Federal workers including the HIV-AIDS and diversity training which was so controversial.

Mr. Speaker, additional details of the bill are addressed in the conference re-

port and in a joint statement of the managers. H.R. 2002 is a fair and balanced and bipartisan bill. It represents a compromise between the House and the Senate. It falls within the committee's 602(b) allocation, and has the support of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to Secretary Peña on Friday, and he said that this bill would be signed, that the administrator was in agreement. In fact, all indications, as I said, from the White House as well as the Office of Management and Budget, I assume, are certain that the President will sign the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it does deserve the support, frankly, of all of the Members, and I urge its adoption swiftly.

I want to thank all of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle for their help and their cooperation. I also want to pay a tribute to all of the staff members, and identify them individually, for the good and the diligent work that they have done on both sides. It was a new team, a new operation, and they did a good job. I would like to acknowledge the following staff who worked on this bill: from

the Majority Subcommittee staff: John Blazey; Rich Efford; Stephanie Gupta; Linda Muir; Deborah Frazier; and Ken Marx; from the Majority associate staff: Lori-Beth Feld Hua; Glenn LeMunyon; Connie Veillette; Jennifer Miller; Bill Deere; Ray Mock; Sean Murphy; Steve Carey; and Paul Cambon; from the Minority Subcommittee staff: Cheryl Smith; and from the Minority associate staff: Christy Cockburn; Kristen Hoeschler; Jim Jepsen; Barbara Zylinski-Mizrahi; and Paul Carver.

I also want to thank Senator HATFIELD, personally somebody that I have always admired for many years. It was a privilege for me to have the opportunity to work with him. He was a complete gentleman, and we really never had any differences that were really the type that you sometimes think about. So I just want to thank Senator HATFIELD and his staff and the Members of that side for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following information for inclusion in the RECORD:

H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Office of the Secretary						
Salaries and expenses.....	58,094,000	57,459,000	55,011,500	56,500,000	56,189,000	-1,905,000
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(1,220,000)					(-1,220,000)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(583,000)					(-583,000)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(7,876,000)					(-7,876,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy.....	(2,309,000)					(-2,309,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.....	(7,887,000)					(-7,887,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(4,400,000)					(-4,400,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,250,000)					(-2,250,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(22,425,000)					(-22,425,000)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(1,380,000)					(-1,380,000)
Executive Secretariat.....	(932,000)					(-932,000)
Contract Appeals Board.....	(630,000)					(-630,000)
Office of Civil Rights.....	(1,779,000)					(-1,779,000)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(936,000)					(-936,000)
Minority Business Resource Center.....	(4,000,000)					(-4,000,000)
Office of Intelligence and Security.....	(800,000)					(-800,000)
Office of Intermodalism.....	(1,000,000)					(-1,000,000)
Undistributed.....	(-2,313,000)					(+2,313,000)
Office of civil rights.....		12,793,000	6,554,000	12,083,000	6,554,000	+6,554,000
Transportation planning, research, and development.....	8,293,000	15,710,000	3,309,000	9,710,000	8,220,000	-73,000
Office of Commercial Space Transportation: Operations and Research.....	6,080,000					-6,080,000
Working capital fund.....	(93,000,000)	(104,364,000)	(102,231,000)	(104,364,000)	(103,149,000)	(+10,149,000)
Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(26,738,539)	(22,800,000)	(-10,823,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(26,738,539)	(22,800,000)	(-10,823,000)
Rescission of contract authority.....	(-4,000,000)	(-38,600,000)	(-23,800,000)	(-11,861,484)	(-16,000,000)	(-12,000,000)
Rescission.....		(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)
Rental payments.....	144,419,000	143,436,000	130,803,000	139,689,000	135,200,000	-9,219,000
Headquarters facilities.....		331,000,000				
Minority business resource center program.....	1,800,000	1,900,000	1,800,000	1,900,000	1,800,000	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	
Minority business outreach.....		2,900,000	2,800,000	2,100,000	2,900,000	+2,900,000
ICC Sunset.....		4,705,000		4,705,000		
State infrastructure loans (sec. 349).....				250,000,000		
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	218,786,000	599,903,000	200,477,500	478,887,000	210,983,000	-7,803,000
(Limitations on obligations).....	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(26,738,539)	(22,800,000)	(-10,823,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(252,189,000)	(599,903,000)	(215,477,500)	(503,425,539)	(233,563,000)	(-18,626,000)
Coast Guard						
Operating expenses.....	2,596,000,000	2,618,316,000	2,565,807,000	2,286,000,000	2,278,991,000	-319,009,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:						
Vessels.....	187,800,000	203,700,000	191,200,000	178,000,000	167,800,000	-20,300,000
Aircraft.....	11,800,000	19,500,000	16,500,000	14,500,000	12,000,000	+200,000
Other equipment.....	29,700,000	56,300,000	42,200,000	47,600,000	49,200,000	+19,500,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation.....	89,350,000	99,800,000	82,275,000	80,200,000	88,675,000	-475,000
Personnel and related support.....	44,200,000	48,900,000	43,000,000	46,500,000	44,700,000	+500,000
Subtotal, A C & I.....	362,850,000	428,200,000	375,175,000	366,800,000	362,375,000	-575,000
Environmental compliance and restoration.....	23,500,000	25,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-2,500,000
Port Safety Development.....				15,000,000	15,000,000	+15,000,000
Alteration of bridges.....		2,000,000	16,000,000	2,000,000	16,000,000	+16,000,000
Retired pay.....	562,585,000	562,022,000	562,022,000	562,022,000	562,022,000	+19,437,000
Reserve training.....	64,861,000	64,859,000	61,859,000	62,000,000	62,000,000	-2,981,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	20,310,000	22,500,000	18,500,000	20,000,000	18,000,000	-2,310,000
Boat safety (Aquatic Resources Trust Fund).....	25,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	-5,000,000
Emergency Fund (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (limitation of permanent appropriation).....			(3,000,000)			
Total, Coast Guard.....	3,657,326,000	3,742,897,000	3,980,163,000	3,354,822,000	3,375,388,000	-281,938,000
Federal Aviation Administration						
Operations.....	4,595,394,000	4,704,000,000	4,800,000,000	4,550,000,000	4,845,712,000	+50,318,000
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	2,087,489,000	1,917,847,000	2,000,000,000	1,880,377,000	1,934,883,000	-152,608,000
Rescission.....	(-35,000,000)		(-80,000,000)	(-70,000,000)	(-60,000,000)	(-25,000,000)
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	259,192,000	267,961,000	143,000,000	215,888,000	185,896,000	-73,494,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	
(Limitation on obligations).....	(1,450,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,800,000,000)	(1,250,000,000)	(1,450,000,000)	
Rescission of contract authority.....				-5,000,000		
Rescission of contract authority (sec. 349 j).....				-250,000,000		

H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Aircraft purchase loan guarantee program..... (Limitation on borrowing authority).....	148,000 (9,970,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	-98,000 (-8,370,000)
Total, Federal Aviation Administration..... (Limitations on obligations).....	6,942,223,000 (1,450,000,000)	6,889,558,000 (1,500,000,000)	6,743,050,000 (1,800,000,000)	6,856,313,000 (1,250,000,000)	6,788,343,000 (1,480,000,000)	-175,880,000
Total budgetary resources.....	(6,362,223,000)	(6,369,558,000)	(6,343,050,000)	(7,906,313,000)	(6,216,343,000)	(-175,880,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations).....		(-1,500,000,000)				
Total budgetary resources.....	(6,362,223,000)	(6,889,558,000)	(6,343,050,000)	(7,906,313,000)	(6,216,343,000)	(-175,880,000)
Federal Highway Administration						
Limitation on general operating expenses.....	(525,341,000)	(689,486,000)	(495,381,000)	(548,434,000)	(509,680,000)	(-15,661,000)
Highway-related safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(+200,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(+200,000)
Rescission of contract authority.....	(-20,000,000)					(+20,000,000)
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund): (Limitation on obligations).....	(17,180,000,000)	(20,254,255,000)	(18,000,000,000)	(17,000,000,000)	(17,550,000,000)	(+390,000,000)
(Exempt obligations).....	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,832,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,806,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(17,000,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(18,200,000,000)	(18,200,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(+2,200,000,000)
Right-of-way revolving fund (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on direct loans).....	(42,500,000)					(-42,500,000)
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(73,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(74,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(78,150,000)	(75,000,000)	(77,225,000)	(+3,225,000)
Surface transportation projects.....	352,055,000			39,500,000		-352,055,000
Rescission.....	(-12,004,000)					(+12,004,000)
High priority corridor (sec. 314A).....	6,000,000					-6,000,000
Orange County, CA toll road project (sec. 336a).....	6,000,000					-6,000,000
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	366,055,000			39,500,000		-366,055,000
(Limitations on obligations).....	(17,244,800,000)	(20,349,255,000)	(18,089,150,000)	(17,088,000,000)	(17,838,225,000)	(+393,425,000)
(Exempt obligations).....	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,832,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,806,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(19,878,558,000)	(20,429,255,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(19,489,007,000)	(19,989,732,000)	(+91,176,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations).....		(-20,134,255,000)				
Total budgetary resources.....	(19,878,558,000)	(205,000,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(19,489,007,000)	(19,989,732,000)	(+91,176,000)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
Operations and research.....	79,558,000	84,588,000	73,316,570	71,281,000	73,316,570	-8,239,430
Rescissions.....			(-4,547,185)			
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund).....	46,997,000	59,744,000	52,011,930	50,344,000	51,884,430	+4,867,430
Subtotal, Operations and research.....	126,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	121,605,000	125,201,000	-1,352,000
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(151,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(155,100,000)	(155,100,000)	(+4,100,000)
State and community highway safety grants (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations).....	(123,000,000)	(168,800,000)	(126,000,000)	(128,000,000)	(127,700,000)	(+4,700,000)
National Driver Register (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations).....	(3,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,100,000)	(2,400,000)	(-1,000,000)
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures programs (Sec. 410) (limitation on obligations).....	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	126,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	121,605,000	125,201,000	-1,352,000
(Limitations on obligations).....	(151,400,000)	(198,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(155,100,000)	(155,100,000)	(+3,700,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(277,953,000)	(340,342,000)	(278,728,500)	(276,705,000)	(280,301,000)	(+2,348,000)
Federal Railroad Administration						
Office of the Administrator.....	13,080,000	17,370,000	14,000,000	14,018,000	14,018,000	+928,000
(By transfer).....	(611,950)					(-611,950)
Local rail freight assistance.....	17,000,000					-17,000,000
Rescission.....	(-6,583,000)					(+6,583,000)
Railroad safety.....	47,729,000	51,104,000	49,840,880	49,105,000	49,919,000	+2,180,000
Railroad research and development.....	20,500,000	48,947,000	21,000,000	25,775,000	24,550,000	+4,080,000
Northeast corridor improvement program.....	200,000,000	235,000,000	100,000,000	130,000,000	115,000,000	-85,000,000
Next generation high speed rail.....	20,000,000	30,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000	19,205,000	-795,000
Trust fund share of next generation high speed rail (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,400,000)	(7,118,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(7,118,000)	(+3,718,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation.....				10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000
Pennsylvania station redevelopment project.....	40,000,000	50,000,000		25,000,000		-40,000,000
Rescission.....	(-40,000,000)					(+40,000,000)
Rhode Island Rail Development.....	5,000,000	10,000,000		2,000,000	1,000,000	-4,000,000

H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation:						
Operations	542,000,000	420,000,000	336,000,000	305,000,000	305,000,000	-237,000,000
Transition costs			62,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	+ 100,000,000
Capital	251,500,000	230,000,000	230,000,000	200,000,000	230,000,000	-21,500,000
Long-term restructuring transition		100,000,000				
Total, Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corp.....	793,500,000	750,000,000	628,000,000	605,000,000	635,000,000	-158,500,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,156,819,000	1,182,421,000	822,840,880	885,888,000	888,882,000	-288,127,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	
Total budgetary resources	(1,161,819,000)	(1,187,421,000)	(827,840,880)	(885,888,000)	(873,882,000)	(-288,127,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program		-1,045,000,000				
Total budgetary resources	(1,161,819,000)	(1,182,421,000)	(827,840,880)	(885,888,000)	(873,882,000)	(-288,127,000)
Federal Transit Administration						
Administrative expenses	43,080,000	44,202,000	39,280,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	-1,080,000
Formula grants	640,000,000	1,244,200,000	490,000,000	585,000,000	542,925,000	-97,075,000
Operating assistance grants	710,000,000	500,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	-310,000,000
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations)	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,110,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,110,000,000)	(-40,000,000)
University transportation centers	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	
Transit planning and research	92,250,000	100,027,000	82,250,000	80,000,000	85,500,000	-6,750,000
Metropolitan planning program		(41,512,500)	(38,438,250)	(40,500,000)	(39,500,000)	(+ 39,500,000)
Rural transit assistance program		(4,812,500)	(4,281,250)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(+ 4,500,000)
Transit cooperative research program		(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(8,250,000)	(8,250,000)	(+ 8,250,000)
National TPR program		(33,982,000)	(19,480,000)	(25,500,000)	(22,000,000)	(+ 22,000,000)
State TPR program		(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(8,250,000)	(8,250,000)	(+ 8,250,000)
National transit institute		(3,000,000)	(2,850,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(+ 3,000,000)
Subtotal, Transit planning and research.....	(92,250,000)	(100,027,000)	(82,250,000)	(80,000,000)	(85,500,000)	(-6,750,000)
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(-29,150,000)
Discretionary grants		59,944,000				
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations):						
Fixed guideway modernization	(725,000,000)	(724,978,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(-69,000,000)
Bus and bus-related facilities	(353,330,000)	(274,982,000)	(333,000,000)	(333,000,000)	(333,000,000)	(-20,330,000)
New starts	(646,670,000)	(724,978,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(+ 19,330,000)
Subtotal, Discretionary grants.....	(1,725,000,000)	(1,724,944,000)	(1,685,000,000)	(1,685,000,000)	(1,685,000,000)	(-60,000,000)
Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(+ 500,000,000)
Interstate transfer grants - transit	48,030,000					-48,030,000
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	170,000,000	200,000,000	
Violent crime reduction program (Violent Crime Trust Fund)		5,000,000				
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,739,340,000	2,159,373,000	1,217,510,000	1,283,000,000	1,278,425,000	-482,915,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(2,875,000,000)	(2,845,784,000)	(2,775,000,000)	(2,785,850,000)	(2,775,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Total budgetary resources	(4,814,340,000)	(5,006,187,000)	(3,982,510,000)	(4,078,850,000)	(4,051,425,000)	(-582,915,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program		-2,184,373,000				
(Limitation on obligations)		(-2,785,850,000)				
Total budgetary resources	(4,814,340,000)	(84,944,000)	(3,982,510,000)	(4,078,850,000)	(4,051,425,000)	(-582,915,000)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation						
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	10,251,000	10,243,000	10,190,500	10,150,000	10,150,000	-101,000
Research and Special Programs Administration						
Research and special programs	28,238,000	31,882,000	28,030,000	24,281,000	23,937,000	-2,301,000
Hazardous materials safety	(12,887,000)	(12,782,000)	(12,800,000)	(12,987,000)	(12,850,000)	(-247,000)
Aviation information management	(2,453,000)	(2,282,000)	(2,322,000)			(-2,453,000)
Emergency transportation	(1,328,000)	(1,301,000)	(1,088,000)	(982,000)	(1,022,000)	(-304,000)
Research and technology	(2,530,000)	(7,804,000)	(3,208,000)	(3,451,000)	(3,288,000)	(+ 758,000)
Program and administrative support	(7,032,000)	(7,883,000)	(7,384,000)	(7,282,000)	(7,388,000)	(+ 366,000)
Accountwide adjustment			(-581,000)	(-411,000)	(-411,000)	(-411,000)
Subtotal, research and special programs.....	(26,238,000)	(31,882,000)	(26,030,000)	(24,281,000)	(23,937,000)	(-2,301,000)
Pipeline safety (Pipeline Safety Fund)	34,991,500	39,720,000	27,243,000	30,275,000	28,750,000	-6,241,500
Pipeline safety (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund)	2,432,500	2,898,000	2,898,000	2,898,000	2,898,000	+ 285,500
Subtotal, Pipeline safety.....	37,424,000	42,618,000	29,941,000	32,973,000	31,448,000	-5,978,000

H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Alaska Pipeline task Force (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (rescission)	(-544,000)					(+544,000)
Emergency preparedness grants: (Emergency preparedness fund)	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,880,000)	(9,200,000)	(8,880,000)	(-1,910,000)
Total, Research and Special Programs Administration	64,082,000	74,480,000	58,371,000	57,854,000	55,785,000	-8,277,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,880,000)	(9,200,000)	(8,880,000)	(-1,910,000)
Total budgetary resources	(74,882,000)	(85,818,000)	(65,281,000)	(68,854,000)	(64,875,000)	(-10,187,000)
Office of Inspector General						
Salaries and expenses	40,000,000	40,238,000	40,238,000	39,881,200	40,238,000	+238,000
Bureau of Transportation Statistics						
Salaries and expenses				2,200,000	2,200,000	+2,200,000
General Provisions						
Administrative provision: Procurement (sec. 323a)	-65,120,000					+65,120,000
Bureau of Transportation Statistics (transfer from Federal-aid Highways)	(15,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
Federal railroad transfer (sec. 341)	3,000,000					-3,000,000
Federal-aid highways (sec. 310 (e))		-574,341,000				
Working capital fund reduction (sec. 327)	-7,000,000		-10,000,000	-5,000,000	-7,500,000	-500,000
DOT field office consolidation (sec. 335)			-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000
ICC transition (sec. 344)			8,421,000		8,421,000	+8,421,000
Total, title I, Department of Transportation (net)	14,134,164,000	14,203,727,029	12,754,756,004	12,559,071,785	12,624,519,029	-1,508,644,971
Appropriations	(14,252,275,000)	(14,249,114,000)	(12,848,880,180)	(12,902,720,200)	(12,707,308,000)	(-1,544,989,000)
Rescissions	(-118,111,000)	(-45,388,971)	(-84,834,158)	(-343,648,435)	(-62,788,971)	(+36,324,029)
(Limitations on obligations)	(21,770,423,000)	(24,907,387,000)	(22,848,440,000)	(21,318,888,538)	(22,054,815,000)	(+284,382,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,806,000)
Total budgetary resources including (limitations on obligations) and (exempt obligations)	(38,172,288,000)	(39,181,114,029)	(37,713,126,004)	(38,210,467,301)	(37,010,841,029)	(-1,181,446,971)
Adjustments made for unified program		-3,189,373,000				
(Limitation on obligations)		(-24,420,105,000)				
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program		24,382,976,000				
Total budgetary resources	(38,172,288,000)	(39,183,985,029)	(37,713,126,004)	(38,210,467,301)	(37,010,841,029)	(-1,181,446,971)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board						
Salaries and expenses	3,350,000	3,656,000	3,656,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	+150,000
National Transportation Safety Board						
Salaries and expenses	37,382,000	38,774,000	38,774,000	37,500,000	38,774,000	+1,382,000
Emergency fund		380,802	180,802	380,802	380,802	+380,802
Total, National Transportation Safety Board	37,382,000	39,134,802	38,934,802	37,880,802	39,134,802	+1,742,802
Interstate Commerce Commission						
Salaries and expenses	30,302,000	28,844,000	13,379,000	13,379,000	13,379,000	-16,923,000
Payments for directed rail service (limitation on obligations)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission	(30,777,000)	(29,319,000)	(13,854,000)	(13,854,000)	(13,854,000)	(-16,923,000)
Panama Canal Commission						
Panama Canal Revolving Fund:						
(Administrative expenses)	(50,030,000)	(50,741,980)	(50,741,000)	(50,741,000)	(50,741,000)	(+711,000)
(Limitation on operating and capital expenses)	(540,000,000)					(-540,000,000)
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority						
Interest payments and repayments of principal	9,183,000					-9,183,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	80,237,000	71,834,802	55,969,802	54,739,802	56,013,802	-24,223,198
(Limitation on obligations)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	
Total budgetary resources	(80,712,000)	(72,109,802)	(56,444,802)	(55,214,802)	(56,488,802)	(-24,223,198)

H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Total appropriations in this bill (net)	14,214,401,000	35,488,984,831	12,810,725,808	12,813,811,587	12,880,532,831	-1,533,888,189
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-2,871,053,000	375,011,000	370,883,000	387,511,148	383,878,148	+3,064,728,148
Grand total (net)	11,543,348,000	35,843,975,831	13,181,708,808	12,981,322,715	13,084,208,979	+1,520,880,979
Appropriations.....	(11,881,458,000)	(35,888,382,802)	(13,278,842,882)	(13,324,971,150)	(13,146,895,950)	(+1,485,536,950)
Recessions.....	(-118,111,000)	(-45,388,971)	(-84,894,188)	(-343,848,435)	(-82,788,871)	(+35,324,029)
(Limitations on obligations).....	(21,770,888,000)	(487,757,000)	(22,848,918,000)	(21,320,383,538)	(22,085,280,000)	(+284,382,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,832,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,808,000)
Grand total budgetary resources including (limitations on obligations) and (exempt obligations).....	(35,581,947,000)	(38,411,732,831)	(38,140,555,808)	(38,833,183,251)	(37,451,005,979)	(+1,889,058,979)
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP						
Total mandatory and discretionary	11,543,348,000	35,843,975,831	13,181,708,808	12,981,322,715	13,084,208,979	+1,520,880,979
Mandatory	571,828,000	582,072,000	582,072,000	582,072,000	582,072,000	+10,148,000
Discretionary:						
Crime trust fund.....		5,000,000				
General purposes.....	10,971,422,000	35,256,903,831	12,599,636,808	12,399,250,715	12,482,138,979	+1,510,714,979
Total, Discretionary.....	10,971,422,000	35,261,903,831	12,599,636,808	12,399,250,715	12,482,138,979	+1,510,714,979

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. COLEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with Chairman WOLF, the gentleman from Virginia, in supporting the conference report on H.R. 2002, the fiscal year 1996 Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill. The conferees faced a tremendous challenge, Mr. Speaker, in determining how to make critical investments in our Nation's transportation infrastructure under what were very tight budget constraints given us as a result of the actions of this Congress on the budget in our 602(b) allocations.

We were \$100 million in budget authority and \$193 million in outlays below the original House 602(b) target for the bill. Accordingly, we did not do what many of us on our side of the aisle believed we should have done in many, many areas. Nonetheless, I believe that this bill has the support of the administration and that the President will indeed sign it.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of managers I think amply documents the final product of the conferees on the transportation bill as was alluded to by Chairman WOLF.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would only make a few statements with respect to the issue of reorganization within the FAA. I understand that this was a critical issue, a matter of high priority not just of the Republican majority, but indeed Secretary Peña came forward very early on, prior indeed to this Congress even convening, telling us how it was that the administration intended to do the kinds of cuts, to make the kinds of streamlining that he felt the Department of Transportation should engage in in order to more effectively serve the American people.

I would say in that regard, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress, in taking up overall the issue of having the FAA administrator, we require him in this legislation to develop new personnel and acquisition systems for the FAA. I am one, and I think I can speak for most of the Democrats on our side in saying that we support freeing the FAA from many problems that may indeed be undermining its ability to modernize the air traffic control system; and we want to be sure, as does the chairman, that we respond efficiently to the needs of the aviation industry and all airline passengers.

Air traffic control system failures in Chicago, New York, Leesburg, Oakland and, just recently, Dallas highlight all too dramatically that the FAA's problems are real and do need immediate attention.

The personnel reform section of this legislation, I want to correct only one statement made by the chairman and that was certainly a lot of us were raising the issue about where we were

going to be with respect to air traffic controllers and FAA employees some weeks prior to the conference, so the chairman may recall that I had raised that issue with him. The conference agreement does charge the FAA Administrator with developing a new personnel system which would give the FAA greater flexibility in hiring and firing, determining promotions and pay, training and location of employees.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that I opposed in conference the committee majority decision to allow the FAA administrator to waive current law pertaining to labor management and employee relations' issues.

□ 1300

I think this is exactly the wrong time to be doing that. When we discuss the issue of being able to have a reorganization to put into jeopardy or to cause fear among employees about whether or not they will continue to have the ability to be represented by their current union management contract, whether or not we are going to rewrite labor law in this reorganization or not, I think is bad policy, particularly in an appropriation bill.

We all know that we have authorizing committees in the House and the Senate to take testimony, to deal with issues such as these. My preference all along was that we not do that in this legislation.

I think the right thing to do is to let those committees properly address the matter through a much more deliberative process than our appropriations could have given it had we even done so. We really did not take into account various and sundry, oftentimes very complicated, labor relations issues in any hearings. We just did not do that.

I believe that in the transportation appropriations bill, with the personnel reform provisions not becoming effective until April 1, 1996, I am very hopeful that that will give time to the appropriate authorizing committees in the House and the Senate, ultimately a conference, and hopefully ultimately signing into law, moving to correct what I consider to be a problem in this bill. It is simply we did not waive that as one of the things we could have waived, and that is the reason I offered that amendment which failed, so that we could waive that and not do this in an appropriations bill.

With that having been said, I will come back to some of the issues a bit later.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, admittedly at this time last year when we became the majority, or thereabouts when I knew that

we were going to be in the majority, the first thing I asked for was a position to serve on this subcommittee. The reason I wanted to serve on this subcommittee is because historically it has been an opportunity to pick and choose, like from a Christmas tree, special projects for my own home district.

I knew as soon as BOB LIVINGSTON told me that he had assigned me to this subcommittee that it was going to be clear sailing for SONNY CALLAHAN because my highway projects, my demonstration projects, my airport projects, and everything, just like it has been for the last 20 years, were going to be in that bill because I was sitting at the table bargaining.

How surprised I was at the first meeting when the chairman called us together and said there are going to be no demonstration projects. I smiled somewhat, saying, yes, I know. But we still are going to get them, is what I thought in the back of my mind.

But let me compliment the chairman. He stood his ground against some of the most powerful, some of the most persuasive people in the House and the Senate, and he did not budge one inch. This is responsible government.

No, I did not get the special 14 projects that I wanted to get. We will get them sooner or later, but we will do it the responsible way, by giving the money to the rightful committee or the rightful agency under our jurisdiction, and we will do it in competition with a fair competition with all States. But we are doing this because of one man and certainly with the cooperation of the minority.

I do not want to take anything away from them, because I did not hear that much argument to his philosophy. But for the first time in at least 20 years we have a responsible transportation bill that no one can come back next month and say, "Look what you did. You gave these special projects without any meaningful purpose all of this money simply because of political pressure and compromising, trying to get a transportation appropriation bill through this House."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress owes a debt of gratitude to the chairman, and this country owes him a great debt of gratitude for the responsible way in which he has handled this bill.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member on the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I simply want to make a few short remarks about it before we vote.

I think the agreement reached by the conferees is, for the most part, a fair agreement that respects the priorities of the House and recognizes the conflicting pressures on us as we try to work in a very difficult budget situation.

I am especially pleased, on a personal note, that my State has continued the

progress which it has made the past few years in receiving a fair share of Federal highway funds. I appreciate the fact that this committee has been helpful in seeing to it that we do not make or that we do not experience any significant backsliding in that respect.

I would note that there is not as much in this bill as we would like to have for highways or for airport investments, but given the fact that the 602(b) allocation, which is set by the Chair of the committee, provided less funding for that than we would have liked, the committee had no choice but to produce a bill within those limitations, and I think it has done a fairly reasonable job under those circumstances.

I would note that there is a significant reduction in transit operating subsidies for communities around the country. Communities are not going to like that. I know some communities in my own district are going to be uncomfortable about it. I wish it could have been otherwise. But the fact is if the public is asking for budget cuts, they have to expect that they are going to get budget cuts, and this is one of the places where those cuts are going to bite.

I hope that we can make some adjustments in the future, but, frankly, it is probably going to be tougher next year than it was this year.

I would make just one observation with respect to the personnel reforms at the Federal Aviation Administration that have been mentioned by both the subcommittee chairman and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], the ranking member. I think all of us wanted to give the FAA additional ability to reorganize its shop, but I want to say that I think that a number of us have concerns about the lack of protections which we feel are in this bill for workers' rights during that reorganization process. The bill, in our view, does not preserve existing statutory requirements pertaining to labor-management and employee relations' issues, and that concerns us very much.

I would simply say to the FAA that, in exercising the prerogatives which they will have under this legislation, I would urge the agency to proceed with utmost caution; and I would urge them to recognize basic elements of fairness as they deal with their employees. Because, if they do not, I think this Congress will and should in short order be right on their tail; and I think the FAA will wish that they had behaved in a sensitive manner.

I would hope that, given the authority which they have been given by this committee, which I think is too broad, I would hope that they would exercise that authority with great discretion. We will be watching.

Let me also say that I will hope the authorizers would take note of the lack of clarity in this bill on that issue, and I would hope that the authorizers would see to it in legislation that they develop that the agency does, in fact,

meet decent standards of decency in dealing with the employees of that agency. I think Congress has a right to expect that and so do the workers at that agency.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a member of the committee.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

I would, first of all, like to commend the fine work of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]; the chairman, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], the ranking minority member, in putting this package together. I think they have done an excellent job of developing and guiding this important funding bill through the entire process.

I believe this is a conference report that we all can support. The House and Senate conferees have developed a transportation funding bill which funds our Nation's urgent infrastructure needs while meeting the tough first-year targets of our drive to balance the Federal budget.

The aviation funding levels in this bill will allow us to move forward with high-priority safety projects such as the new air traffic control system which will finally take us out of the vacuum tube era.

By rejecting a Senate proposal for new aviation taxes, we have taken the first important step toward rejecting the administration's misguided claim of a pending aviation funding shortage. Frankly, a close examination of future aviation funding needs does not automatically suggest a need for more aviation taxes, and the conferees recognized that fact. In fact, with the personnel and procurement reform in the bill, we may find that we have more than adequate money within the FAA.

The personnel procurement reforms we have put in place will save taxpayers' money, at the same time accelerate the modernization of the FAA and drag them out of the 1950s into the 1990s.

Contrary to what some might say, an FAA personnel reform plan will not disband the unions. In fact, with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] as chairman of this committee and his strong support for Federal employees, that is a great stretch of the imagination in the first place. But what it will do is give the administrator the flexibility that the administration requested and needs to make FAA run in a more efficient way.

We have also included language in the statement of managers recommending the FAA establish a high-level industry working group to assist in developing the FAA's personnel and procurement reform plans. This is the first step toward a permanent FAA management advisory committee.

These FAA reform provisions are a start. I am pleased to say the cause of

FAA reform will move further tomorrow when my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, will hold a markup of the Duncan-Lightfoot independent FAA bill.

Again, in closing, let me commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] as well as the subcommittee's fine staff: John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta, Lori-Beth Hua, Debra Frazier and Linda Muir. Without their help, we could not get any of this done. They have done a very fine job.

I urge the adoption of this report.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of engaging the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee in a brief colloquy regarding a critical bay area transportation project. The Tasman Corridor light rail project is an integral piece of the local rail agreement fashioned by our regional metropolitan planning organization, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. All of the bay area jurisdictions are a party to this agreement which represents the best in local planning and decisionmaking. When the California Supreme Court on September 28 invalidated the so-called Measure A, a half-cent sales tax dedicated to many important highway, commuter rail, and transit construction projects in Santa Clara County, the planned-for local match for the Tasman project was assumed to be lost. Due to the perseverance of all involved, in the few short weeks since the ruling, the Tasman Corridor plan has been revised to reflect the new fiscal realities. It has been proposed that only the west extension to Mountain View be built at this time. This segment is compelling. The 7.5-mile line is expected to cost \$125 million less than the original project, with 50 percent of its funding derived from Federal Sec. 3 New Start funds. Of the \$122 million in proposed new starts funding, some \$33 million has already been appropriated and dedicated to the Tasman project by the MTC. The remainder of the funding will come from identified State, local and ISTEA flexible funding sources. This revised plan has the unanimous backing of the transit agency board, and I expect shortly will be approved by the MTC and later included in the California Transportation Commission's revised States Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of these positive developments, and in deference to the local and regional planning process which has served us well, I would ask if the chairman agrees that if the revised Tasman project secures all requisite Federal,

State, and regional approvals in a timely fashion, the \$33 million in unobligated balances referenced in the conference report may be provided by the MTC for the commencement of construction on the Tasman West extension.

□ 1315

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. ESHOO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yes, that is my understanding.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for his understanding. I am very grateful for his thoughtful response.

I would also like to acknowledge the gentleman's staff that has worked with us on this. I look forward to working with the gentleman in making certain that the plan for the Tasman West extension is financially sound, that it is accountable, that it is responsible and that it continues to enjoy the important broad-based support it has had in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] who would like to make some comments on this.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Ms. ESHOO] for taking the lead in this colloquy as well as my other Bay Area colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together in support of the Tasman light-rail project.

I particularly would like to thank the chairman for reaffirming his commitment to local transit agencies and their authority over transit funding decisions.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of the committee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1996 transportation funding conference bill. Chairman FRANK WOLF deserves high praise for his hard work and diligence in structuring funding for our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

This bill continues Congress' investment in the Nations infrastructure, providing \$12.5 billion in discretionary budget authority for highways, transits systems, airports, and the Coast Guard. Also included in this bill, is a provision I wholeheartedly support. It denies funding for HIV/AIDS awareness training unless it specifically relates to the workplace rights of HIV-positive employees or to the medical ramifications of HIV/AIDS.

In tight fiscal times such as these, Congress must evaluate all Federal spending and determine where we can get the most bang for the buck. We took a long hard look at the merits of every program in our bill.

For example, the conference agreement includes no special highway demonstration projects, returning some

\$350 million in Federal highway aid to the States. Doing so provides greater equity among the States and allows State Governors and departments of transportation to determine the appropriate expenditure of limited Federal highway assistance.

This bill builds America. We provide a network of transportation that moves America—its people, its products, its services—across town or across the Nation. This bill provides necessary funding to make our citizens mobile and allow our goods and services to get to market. It creates jobs, builds our Nation's infrastructure and ensures the safety of our traveling public.

This is a good, solid bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], and all the members of the conference committee for holding fast in the face of strong opposition from the other body on section 501 of the House version of the transportation appropriations conference report.

This section, an amendment originally offered by myself and by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], provides that no funds appropriated in this bill may be used to tear down and move a few hundred feet at a cost of \$300 million a highway we just finished rebuilding in place for \$90 million.

The only purpose of this proposed boondoggle was to support a proposed luxury housing project being developed and to make the views of this housing project being developed in my district by Donald Trump and his business associates. This measure was supported unanimously by sides of the aisle and shows how this body can come together on issues to benefit the American taxpayer. Again, I want to thank the leaders of the conference committee for their support in this matter.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would only attempt to, if I could, since I do not have any other requests for time of any Members that are here to simply add, if I might, in closing, my appreciation for the fine work and hard effort of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman, and the staff that they assembled, Mr. Speaker. All of us know that we cannot do these jobs without the hard work of a lot of very dedicated and fine men and women who help us put together these numbers so that they work, but also they negotiate many times for us with the agencies so we can understand

some of the problems some of the cuts might cause.

In addition, they are able to carry forward some of the arguments that we as Members literally in the committees and in conference do not always get to hear. I particularly want to thank and commend the persons who work hard on the staff.

In addition, if I might, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be wrong for any of us as Members standing here today to talk about a transportation bill that has been nearly a year in the making to not also signal our appreciation to certainly our colleagues on the committee. I know a number have spoken from the other side. I only wanted to highlight the fact that I have been on my side of the aisle blessed with having wonderful cooperation, a lot of history, by the way, from Members who are actually more senior than I on this particular subcommittee.

I wanted to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and certainly one of the more important Members because of his status as the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and one of our newer Members but a Member who understands mass transit in its very intricate forms, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], and all of their staffs for their advice and counsel as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who wanted to discuss some of the issues pertinent to the Coast Guard.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

I wanted to indicate support for the conference on two fronts. One is with regard to the office of pipeline safety.

I think some of the Members know that almost 2 years ago now in my congressional district in New Jersey we had an explosion, a natural gas pipeline explosion in the area known as Durham Woods. As a consequence of that, I realized how significant funding levels for pipeline safety were, not only in terms of what has to be done in terms of investigation but, even more important, in terms of prevention.

The amount of money that is provided in this conference bill for pipeline safety is better, significantly better than what I thought might result. I am very pleased with that because I know it will allow us to continue to do the kind of work that needs to be done to prevent accidents as the one that occurred in Edison, in my district.

I also wanted to congratulate the conferees and the bill on the fact that, with regard to the small boat Coast Guard stations, there is language that would prohibit their closures. Those of us who fought very hard on the House floor, who felt that the small boat plan that the Coast Guard had put forward was not going to save a significant

amount of money and would actually cost lives appreciate the fact that there is language in this bill now that would prohibit those small boat station closures.

It was not something that was going to save money. So I think that it is consistent with the effort on the part of the committee to try to reduce expenditures, but allowing those stations to close would not have accomplished that fact. So I want to congratulate, thank again the gentleman from Texas as well as the chairman of the subcommittee for their efforts in the conference and urge support for the conference bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, in closing, if I might, Mr. Speaker, I have only one other speaker who may or may not be able to be here because of a conflict in meetings. So in any event, if I could, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], my friend, earlier referred to the fact that the chairman stood strong against any particular highway demo projects.

One of our colleagues in the conference from another State, however, did correctly point out that he was from a State that was not as populous as Virginia or Texas or California and that indeed sometimes it is necessary to provide the highway funding instead of doing airport improvement projects or instead of doing bus or transit new starts. Therefore, he felt it was perfectly legitimate that we indeed as members of our respective committees in the House and the Senate be able to provide funding for highways.

As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] knows, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] knows, we have not stopped anybody over on the authorizing committee from also authorizing and providing contract authority for specific highway demonstration projects. That has happened in the past under ISTEA. We are told it may happen in the future. I think we have got a ways to go. I think this is a good beginning.

I know that the chairman recalled that in an actual vote on the House side, all of the Democrats on our side of the aisle did not oppose him. Indeed, to a person, we supported his effort to not—we think this is a good beginning—to not designate highway demo projects. Many of us think that perhaps we can move forward next year and do the same thing, when it comes to transit. Maybe we should do exactly the same thing when it comes to buses and other kinds of projects of that nature.

We think it is a good beginning, Mr. Speaker. So, therefore, I want to finally only thank specifically two Members without whom I could not have operated my first term as ranking member of a Subcommittee on Appropriations, Ms. Cheryl Smith and Christy Coburn for their hard work. Cheryl has

had to wear on our side many hats this session. She had to juggle her responsibilities of this subcommittee as well as to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. She has done an exemplary job, and then Ms. Coburn also from my office staff who has worked with the committee on all of these issues.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Transportation appropriations conference report. It is a responsible bill—one that I believe all Members can support.

I want to thank my chairman, Mr. WOLF, for having the patience over the last few weeks waiting to get this bill through conference and onto the floor. On his first trip through the process as chairman, he has done a masterful job of crafting this legislation that is before us today and I commend him on his efforts.

It is important to note that there are many good things in the bill which keep us on message. This bill, while providing for a strong national infrastructure, also includes many policy statements that will benefit our Nation immediately and in the future. A good example must be the fact that there are no highway demonstration projects in this bill. What that means is there are no unforeseen priorities that the States have to take into consideration. What this means is that there is more money for States to accomplish their priorities in a timely manner. Having no highway demonstration projects in the bill gives the legislation integrity, and it gives the States confidence in the way we conduct business. This is what the American people and the State governments expect and this is what they deserve.

In my home State of Texas, a donor State, highway spending will increase by \$31 million over last year's level. Hopefully, this increase will assist the State in their construction of some important projects including several U.S. Highway 59 projects through my district. The conference agreement also approves continued funding for Houston metro's regional bus plan. Houston Metro is noted for having the lowest cost-per-new-rider index in the Nation. The continued funding for this program will assist in the efficient movement of people, goods, and services through the Houston area.

With regards to airports, the conference elected to fund airport improvement programs at last year's level. In the face of both competing funding demands and ironclad budget constraints, I am pleased that were at least able to halt the downward funding spiral that airports have experienced over the last 3 years. However, in light of future air travel demands, I feel that it is important that Congress be ready with a plan that allows for the proper financing of our airport infrastructure in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, a bill all Members can support. I urge all Members to support this responsible measure before us today.

□ 1330

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 29, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 735]

YEAS—393

Allard	Dickey	Houghton
Archer	Dicks	Hoyer
Armey	Dingell	Hunter
Bachus	Dixon	Hutchinson
Baesler	Doggett	Hyde
Baker (CA)	Dooley	Inglis
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Istook
Baldacci	Dornan	Jackson-Lee
Ballenger	Doyle	Jacobs
Barcia	Dreier	Jefferson
Barr	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Johnson, E. B.
Bartlett	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Ehlers	Johnston
Bass	Ehrlich	Jones
Bateman	Emerson	Kanjorski
Bentsen	Engel	Kasich
Bereuter	English	Kelly
Berman	Ensign	Kennedy (MA)
Bevill	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bilbray	Evans	Kennelly
Bilirakis	Everett	Kildee
Bishop	Ewing	Kim
Bliley	Farr	King
Blute	Fattah	Kingston
Boehlert	Fawell	Klecza
Boehner	Fazio	Klink
Bonilla	Fields (TX)	Klug
Bonior	Flake	Knollenberg
Bono	Flanagan	Kolbe
Boucher	Foley	LaFalce
Brewster	Forbes	LaHood
Browder	Ford	Lantos
Brown (CA)	Fowler	Largent
Brown (FL)	Fox	Latham
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Brownback	Franks (CT)	Laughlin
Bryant (TN)	Franks (NJ)	Lazio
Bryant (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Leach
Bunn	Frisa	Levin
Bunning	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Furse	Lewis (GA)
Burton	Gallegly	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Ganske	Lightfoot
Callahan	Gedensson	Lincoln
Calvert	Gekas	Linder
Camp	Gephardt	Lipinski
Canady	Geren	Livingston
Cardin	Gibbons	LoBiondo
Castle	Gilchrest	Lofgren
Chabot	Gillmor	Longley
Chambliss	Gilman	Lowey
Chenoweth	Gonzalez	Lucas
Christensen	Goodlatte	Luther
Chrysler	Goodling	Maloney
Clay	Gordon	Manton
Clayton	Goss	Manzullo
Clement	Graham	Markey
Clinger	Green	Martini
Coble	Greenwood	Mascara
Coburn	Gunderson	Matsui
Coleman	Gutierrez	McCarthy
Collins (GA)	Gutknecht	McCollum
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Combest	Hall (TX)	McDade
Condit	Hamilton	McDermott
Conyers	Hancock	McHale
Cooley	Hansen	McHugh
Costello	Harman	McInnis
Cox	Hastert	McIntosh
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Crane	Hayes	McNulty
Crapo	Hayworth	Meehan
Cremeans	Hefley	Meek
Cubin	Hefner	Metcalf
Cunningham	Heineman	Meyers
Davis	Herger	Mfume
de la Garza	Hilleary	Mica
Deal	Hinchey	Miller (CA)
DeFazio	Hobson	Miller (FL)
DeLauro	Hoekstra	Minge
DeLay	Hoke	Mink
Dellums	Holden	Moakley
Deutsch	Horn	Molinari
Diaz-Balart	Hostettler	Mollohan

Montgomery	Richardson	Stump
Moorhead	Riggs	Stupak
Moran	Rivers	Talent
Morella	Roberts	Tanner
Murtha	Roemer	Tate
Myers	Rogers	Tauzin
Myrick	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Neal	Rose	Tejeda
Neuhart	Roth	Thomas
Neumann	Roukema	Thompson
Ney	Royce	Thornberry
Norwood	Sabo	Thornton
Nussle	Salmon	Thurman
Oberstar	Sanford	Tiahrt
Obey	Sawyer	Torkildsen
Olver	Saxton	Torricelli
Ortiz	Scarborough	Towns
Orton	Schiff	Upton
Owens	Schroeder	Velazquez
Oxley	Schumer	Vento
Packard	Scott	Visclosky
Pallone	Seastrand	Vucanovich
Parker	Serrano	Waldholtz
Pastor	Shadegg	Walker
Paxon	Shaw	Walsh
Payne (VA)	Shays	Wamp
Pelosi	Shuster	Ward
Peterson (FL)	Skaggs	Watts (OK)
Petri	Skeen	Waxman
Pickett	Smith (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Porter	Smith (TX)	White
Portman	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Poshard	Solomon	Wicker
Pryce	Souder	Wise
Quillen	Spence	Wolf
Quinn	Spratt	Woolsey
Radanovich	Stark	Wyden
Rahall	Stearns	Wynn
Ramstad	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Rangel	Stockman	Young (FL)
Reed	Stokes	Zeliff
Regula	Studds	Zimmer

NAYS—29

Ackerman	Hilliard	Schaefer
Andrews	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Becerra	Martinez	Slaughter
Bellenson	Menendez	Torres
Borski	Payne (NJ)	Trafficant
Clyburn	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Collins (IL)	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
Danner	Roybal-Allard	Williams
Filner	Rush	Yates
Foglietta	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—10

Abercrombie	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Chapman	Skelton	Wilson
Fields (LA)	Tucker	
Funderburk	Volkmer	

□ 1353

Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. FOGLIETTA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CLAY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. 4, THE SEPARATE ENROLLMENT AND LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 1995

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on the Senate bill (S. 4) to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEUTSCH moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the House amendments to the bill S. 4 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to insist upon the inclusion of provisions to require that the bill apply to the targeted tax benefit provisions of any revenue or reconciliation bill enacted into law during or after fiscal year 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, on February 6 of this year, this House passed by a 294 vote a line-item veto bill. The Senate subsequently passed the vote as well. It took 7 months. We went through the winter, the spring, the summer, and then we came into the fall, just about the fall again, and September 20, conferees were appointed.

I think there is a question, really, of the sincerity of conferees and appointing conferees when it has taken this long. This is an idea which not only has the support or the voting support of the majority of the Members of this House, but I really think a clear majority of the American people as well: 38 States have line-item vetoes. If we are talking about fiscal restraint, this is the way to go.

What this proposal does, Mr. Speaker, what this motion to instruct says is if we are going to have a line-item veto, let us get the job done. Let us apply it to 1995 appropriations bills and budget bills.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. We are in the midst of a prolonged hearing on the reconciliation bill up in the Committee on Rules. We have listened to five witnesses over 3½ hours. We have 65 more to go. Hopefully, we will be able to bring the Members a bill tomorrow.

Let me just say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], if he will pay attention over there, without all the discussion, he mentioned or questioned the sincerity of the conferees. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to question his sincerity. I do not think we should do that. He is a friend of mine, and he is a good Member of this body. But, I just have to point out, it is strange that his name appears on the National Taxpayers Union list of big spenders, and yet, he is up here talking about the sincerity of the conferees on the line-item veto. That bothers me a little bit.

First, let me just say this. The amendment does not do what the gen-

tleman claims it does. Neither the House nor the Senate version of the line-item veto contained any retroactive provisions dealing with targeted tax benefits.

The House version did contain retroactive language regarding the applicability to appropriation measures for fiscal year 1995, but that authority was not extended to revenue measures. The gentleman's motion calls upon conferees to apply the targeted tax provisions to any revenue or any reconciliation measure enacted into law during fiscal year 1995. At the same time, the motion urges the conferees to stay within the scope of the conference. These instructions are inconsistent. We cannot have it both ways.

If the gentleman had not included the phrase "within the scope of the conference," he would have been deliberately instructing the conferees to go beyond the scope of the conference, which the gentlemen well knows would be a violation of the rules of the House, and subject to a point or order.

Because he did include this phrase, we can only conclude that this entire motion is purely politically driven, a poor attempt to try and embarrass those Members who happen to support both the line-item veto and the landmark balanced budget we will be approving here on this floor tomorrow.

Because the gentleman's motion is inherently contradictory, I urge that we accept the motion and can honestly state that we will follow the instructions. We will make the line-item veto, as it applies to targeted tax benefits, as retroactive as possible within "his amendment," the scope of the conference, which, according to the gentleman's motion, is not retroactive at all.

□ 1400

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, they are important groups and I seek their support. The organization that you mention is not one of them.

Let me also mention that I would like to offer a wager to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], of Florida oranges versus New York apples, as the whether this is ultimately adopted into law. In front of the world I offer the gentleman that wager. If the gentleman is willing to accept it, I would be happy for him to accept it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to take the gentleman's bet.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The line-item veto was always intended to apply both to appropriations